

**REMARKS**

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Objection under 37CFR 1.75(c)

Applicant has amended dependent claims 2 and 3 so that they depend from claims 1 and 2, respectively, to overcome the objection raised by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 USC 103

Applicant respectfully disagrees with examiner that the claimed invention is unpatentable over Shishkin (US 4,891,115) in view of Estes (US 5,299,359).

Shishkin is concerned with a wholly different type of cleaning and repair apparatus than the present application. Shishkin operates on the principle of automatically cleaning deposits on the pipe surface and applying a new coating to the interior surface of the pipe as it moves through the interior of the pipe.

The present application, however, is concerned with a more targeted cleaning and repair mechanism. Thus it requires a monitoring apparatus that is capable of detecting a section of pipe to be repaired and to effect the repair at that detected location. In order to achieve this localised detecting and repair, the claimed invention needs to be considered as a whole as it comprises a monitoring apparatus, a cleaning apparatus, and a repair apparatus.

It would not have been obvious to the skilled person, at the time of the invention, to adapt Shishkin with the monitoring apparatus disclosed in Estes to produce the present invention since the repair apparatus of Shishkin is not localised and functions automatically to clean the pipe and apply a coating as it moves through the pipe.

The examiner argues that Estes discloses a corrosion monitoring mechanism, but these are known as is acknowledged on page 1, second paragraph, of the present application as filed. That is, apparatus are known for determining the extent of corrosion, but there exists no additional apparatus for concurrently repairing the corroded pipe downhole without pulling the pipe out of the wellbore. There is no indication in Estes of an in-situ repair apparatus; instead the passage relied on by the examiner (col. 1, lines 22-36) describes that the result of such corrosion measurement is to replace tubing that is about to fail (see col. 1 line 29).

Moreover, the 'replacement' of corroded pipe in Estes is wholly different to the 'coating' of corroded pipe in Shishkin, making these prior art references incompatible.

Independent claims 1 and 4 recite the features of cleaning, plating, and examining that combine to provide the advantageous effect of performing the repair operation in-situ downhole at a specific location where corrosion has occurred. Claims 1 and 4 and their dependent claims are therefore patentable over the prior art relied upon by the examiner. Reconsideration by the examiner is requested.

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed October 9, 2007 for which the three-month date for response was January 9, 2008. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), Applicants petition for an extension of time of two months in which to respond to the Office Action. This two month extension will bring the deadline for response to March 9, 2008 which is within the six-month statutory period.

Appl. No. 10/518,883  
Amendment to office action dated October 9, 2007

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-2183  
(Reference Number 68.0327).

Dated: March 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Bryan L. White/  
Bryan L. White  
Registration No.: 45,211  
Schlumberger Technology Corp.  
200 Gillingham Lane  
Sugar Land, TX 77478  
281-285-6493 (tel)  
281-285-8821 (fax)